

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 22 2004

LADAS & PARRY
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL3670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036-5679
Telephone: (323) 934-2300
Facsimile: (323) 934-0202

DELIVER TO: Examiner Cherry, Eunha P. Art Unit 2872

COMPANY: United States Patent and Trademark Office

FAX NUMBER: (703) 872-9306

FROM: Robert Popa

DATE: November 22, 2004

TOTAL NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS PAGE): 5

SUBJECT : Response to Second Restriction Requirement
U.S. Application No. 10/649,075
Daniel Yap
"Optical Bond-Wire Interconnections . . ."
Our Ref: B-3858DIV 620913-1/RPB

REMARKS:

Examiner Cherry:

Enclosed is a response to the Office Action mailed on October 20, 2004 consisting of:

Response to second restriction requirement - 4 pages

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential or privileged information from the law firm of Ladas & Parry. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

*If transmission incomplete, please call (323) 934-2300 and
ask for the operator named above.*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Daniel Yap)	Group Art No.: 2872
Application No: 10/649,075)	Examiner: Cherry, Euncha P
Filed: August 26, 2003)	Re: RESPONSE TO
)	SECONDR RESTRICTION
)	REQUIREMENT
For: "OPTICAL BOND-WIRE)	Our Ref: B-3858DIV 620913-1/RPB
INTERCONNECTIONS AND)	
A METHOD FOR)	
FABRICATION THEREOF ")	
)	Date: November 22, 2004

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 22 2004

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the second restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action dated October 20, 2004, a reply to which is initially due by November 22, 2004 (Monday). Please consider the following remarks with respect to the subject application. All remarks herein are made without prejudice.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

USSN: 10/649,075
Group No. 2872
Examiner: Cherry, Euncha P
Page 2

REMARKS

In the Office Action of October 20, 2004 the Examiner asserts that the present application contains claims directed to two patentably distinct species of the claimed invention, Species I (claims 2-28) and Species II (claims 42 and 43).

The Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the requirement for restriction as discussed below.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that, as set forth in MPEP 816:

'The particular reasons relied on by the examiner for holding that the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given.'

The Applicant submits that the Examiner, by stating that Species I relates to "an interconnection for interconnecting microelectronic chips with optical wires comprising a segment of an optical fiber that have two opposite ends, first end and second end, that ends being attached to the microelectronic chips by means of termination" and Species II relates to "an optical interconnection for connecting an optical fiber to integrated circuits by optical fibers including an inclined surface for reflecting light," has merely concluded that the species as claimed are independent or distinct by repeating portions of the language of some of the claims and has not provided the requisite reasons for that conclusion.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action of October 20, 2004 is improper.

Applicant further notes that the additional number of Species II claims is only two. The Examiner is respectfully reminded of MPEP 803, which requires that "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." In view of the limited number of Species II claims, we submit that

Sender: 618072

Sender: 618076

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☐ **BLACK BORDERS**

☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

☒ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

☒ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

☐ **LINE(S) OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

☒ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.